| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  The hook may be improvised, but I still prefer this over no hook.  On the counter set-up:   * It isn’t clear what we are asking consumers to do in your world beyond a boycott, so we can make the comparison on the kind of changes that will happen in both worlds.   + We should’ve highlighted the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve. * Excellent pushback on why corporate compliance cannot be asserted by Prop, this belongs in a separate rebuttal, not in the set-up. * We should highlight that this is about what the environmental movement should focus on, so we can point out that Proposition cannot propose laws today.   + They have to prove that green movements have the ability to pressure the government to change vs on your side, it’s easier for you to influence consumers.   + So Opp’s changes WILL happen because green consumers are a captive audience by the green movement, but Prop cannot mechanise their arguments.   On whether consumers care, we’re explaining the rise of ethical consumerism from a business sense. We should be explaining that consumers are starting to care about being green in particular.   * Spend some time actually characterising this claim:   + Explain that environmental consciousness is on the rise thanks to global media.   + Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy.   + Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy. * We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience.   Good spot that it takes even more motivation and capital to convert the ‘care’ of consumers into actual voting issues that can influence the state.  Strong argument on how difficult it is to convince politicians.   * After analysing lobbying as the biggest opp, give examples of powerful lobbyists that win against public interest and are able to make the government deregulate, e.g. big pharma, NRA, etc. * Take this further and explain that even if the policies are passed, companies have the ability to find regulatory loopholes in order to not change in any meaningful ways.   On the second argument:   * I appreciate the claim on potentially making this trendy, but I’m not sure how it is or how it WILL be trendy. Give me some grounding. * On contrasting this with boycotts, I am clear that it CAN happen, but it isn’t clear that it will happen on a SCALE that is meaningful enough to force companies to actually change!   + Analyse the business models of companies to explain why companies are likely to listen to consumer boycotts. You can also explain why this is in line with future-proofing their business model and why companies will go green in your world.     - We eventually mentioned this in one line on shareholders holding the companies accountable, this is where we needed to spend more time on.     - We need to be more comparative! Defend the power of consumers.   Offer more POIs, please!  7.05 - Good timing! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  The hook is under-executed, don’t stop at just the observation. Tell me why if they think the consumers are dumb, then those same people will not be able to pressure the state either to pass all of these green laws that Prop wanted.  On the effectiveness of consumer boycotts:   * We need to actually show WHY listening to boycotts benefit their business model MORE than the compliance to the government’s green laws, instead of just asserting that it’s aligned with profit incentives. * On the changes that Opp is making, it isn’t clear what we are asking consumers to do in your world beyond a boycott, so we can make the comparison on the kind of changes that will happen in both worlds.   + We should’ve highlighted the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve. * Spend some time actually characterising your claim on consumers caring:   + Explain that environmental consciousness is on the rise thanks to global media.   + Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy.   + Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy.   + We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience.   We should highlight that this is about what the environmental movement should focus on, so we can point out that Proposition cannot propose laws today.   * They have to prove that green movements have the ability to pressure the government to change vs on your side, it’s easier for you to influence consumers.   + So Opp’s changes WILL happen because green consumers are a captive audience by the green movement, but Prop cannot mechanise their arguments.   On governments won’t actually change and politicians aren’t benevolent:   * Good job reinforcing Jodie’s claims on corporate lobbying, but don’t just say Jodie has said it, make it comparative to all of the government incentives argued by Joanne!   + E.g. Joanne argued that governments have to protect public well-being from environmental disasters, so point out that gaining electoral power in the short-term is far more important to the incumbent state than long-term well-being. That’s a problem for a future state. * Spend time pushing back on why corporate compliance cannot be asserted by Prop.   On the long-term impact to the environment:   * If it’s just a matter of making consumers choose green products, we have to engage with Prop stating that it’s not their fault if there are limited green products.   + We should’ve highlighted ALL the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat; and then impact why each one of these things are so crucial in protecting the environment. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve.   While consumers do have an impact in their business model, we have to engage with the specific criticisms made by the speaker against you on this point:   * They mentioned that companies can manipulate consumers into thinking that they’re doing well, so boycotts would fail here. * They argued that the government can target all companies at the same time vs consumers cannot hurt all the companies at the same time. * While we mentioned that companies have to listen to their customers in their business model, we didn’t say WHY. Explain that there is an opportunity cost in the market and their competitors will steal consumers if they do not listen.   + Later on, we mentioned this, well done! But what about the companies who cared little about their brand image?   We need to be more comparative! Why can’t Prop co-opt the same outcomes when the state is punishing companies?   * All the reasons we gave on future-proofing can be co-opted by the Prop as to why companies will then comply with the green laws.   We need to offer more POIs today, Gemma!  7.09 - Good timing. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 70 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  The hook may be improvised, but I still prefer this over no hook.  On consumer boycotts being ineffective:   * Good job reinforcing consumer manipulation and getting away with doing the bare minimum. Explain precisely HOW they’re able to do this by funding expert media campaigns.   + Spend time characterising how damaging the tactic of greenwashing is!   + However, these are people in the green movement that Opp is saying will engage in consumer boycott. Why do they lack the same kind of vigilance or scrutiny? * Don’t stop here!! Explain that the government can make all the companies change in one go versus the limited efforts that consumers can engage in; make this even more comparative by taking down Opp’s methods! * Say that it’s difficult for consumers to boycott a MAJORITY of products when green products are not even accessible to begin with. * We can add a moral angle here as well. Explain that making more responsible choices often comes at the expense of their own quality of life, this isn’t fair. Whereas companies have all the wealth they need to make the transition to a green system. So we must hurt companies, not consumers.   Don’t take the POI immediately, finish your sentence first.  We needed to rebut Jodie’s argument on being green is a weak voting issue!  On the government having the incentive to make these changes:   * We have to be comparative to what Opp is arguing. She argued that corporate lobbying will overcome a lot of the state incentives, so you cannot argue your reasons in a vacuum. You have to argue why your reasons are MORE powerful than corporate lobbying.   + E.g. Explain why voters will punish the government if they are being lied to. * I appreciate all of the reasons as to why the state actively benefits from imposing green laws.   + But bear in mind that this means the state will do this regardless of whether the green movement actually spends any capital in this strategy!   + This debate boils down to a comparative as to where the green movement ought to spend their limited capital on.   If the voters on your side are so strongly organised that they can convince the state to change, this will also benefit the Opp when they argue that the same voters will be pressuring companies.   * On the flip side, we haven’t analysed why the environmental movement will be able to convince the government to make all of these hefty changes.   We have to analyse WHY exactly companies do not have the natural incentive to change and go green. Analyse why business models will always reward polluting, and why specific types of companies do not respond to consumer boycotts.   * Compliance with regulations cannot be asserted, explain why the repercussions of violating the regulations would either destroy their business model, or threaten their ability to stay open.   There was no environmental impacting throughout the speech! Focus on actually saving the environment in your final argument.  Offer more POIs, Joanne!  7.22 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Jiang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  I appreciate the use of your hook to add clarity on what the comparative of the debate is. When stating that these companies are evil, execute this fully. Point out that the root cause of the climate crisis are the companies and hammer this down with real facts, e.g. 70% of all pollution is emitted by 100 companies.   * Good job signposting your speech and Joanne’s speech.   On the set-up:   * Before saying that you will pressure the state, mention first that this is from the perspective of the green movement. * Good job highlighting exactly the regulations and requirements that companies are forced to comply with.   + I appreciate the severe financial penalties and the suspension of business licenses.   + We should also include positive policies such as including tax benefits to enable companies to transition. Otherwise, we leave companies no choice but to resist compliance via other tactics.   On the first argument on why consumer responsibility will fail:   * Good start on consumers being selfish, but bear in mind that the movement’s captive audience are probably environmentally-conscious consumers. * Nice spot that being green is a privileged choice, but explain how so, i.e. why exactly are green choices expensive and inaccessible. * Then immediately contrast this with the fact that it is the companies who have the capacity to produce green products and make them affordable. So the change needs to be imposed by the state. * Excellent reasoning that companies often engage in consumer manipulation, which allows them to get away with greenwashing. Explain precisely HOW they’re able to do this by funding expert media campaigns.   + Spend time characterising how damaging the tactic of greenwashing is!   + However, these are people in the green movement. Why do they lack the same kind of vigilance or scrutiny?   Why does culpability matter? Explain that making more responsible choices often comes at the expense of their own quality of life, this isn’t fair. Whereas companies have all the wealth they need to make the transition to a green system. So we must hurt companies, not consumers.  On the second argument on the government being able to enforce change:   * Spend more time analysing why exactly companies do not have the natural incentive to change and go green, and this is why your case matters. Analyse why business models will always reward polluting, and why specific types of companies do not respond to consumer boycotts. * Compliance with regulations cannot be asserted, explain why the repercussions of violating the regulations would either destroy their business model, or threaten their ability to stay open. And things like lobbying will not be able to overcome this.   I need to know why the environmental movement is capable of convincing the government better than they can convince consumers.  There was no environmental impacting throughout the speech! Focus on actually saving the environment in your final argument.  Don’t forget to offer POIs!  7.05 - Good timing. | | | | | | |